REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the specification:

The disclosure is objected to due to informalities:

5 Response:

Paragraphs [0026]. [0028], and [0037] of the specification have been amended to correct informalities present in the specification as filed. The amendments made to paragraph [0037] are supported in claims 16 and 18, and no new matter is added.

10

15

20

Acceptance of the amended specification is respectfully requested.

2. Objection to claims 11, 15-18, 22, and 24:

Claims 11, 15-18, 22, and 24 are objected to due to lack of antecedent basis.

Claims 16, 18, 22, and 24 are objected to as failing to conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification.

Response:

Claims 11, 15-18, 22, and 24 have each been amended to overcome the informalities contained in the original claims.

Paragraph [0037] of the specification has been amended to agree with the limitations contained in 16, 18, 22, and 24. Acceptance of the claims is respectfully requested.

25

3. Rejection of claims 1-3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al. (US 5,856,048).

30 Response:

Appl. No. 10/711,032 Amdt. dated April 09, 2008 Reply to Office action of January 25, 2008

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the method comprises the step of "adjusting a disposition of the print medium, the light source and the light-sensing component by moving the print medium with respect to the light-sensing component from a first position to a second position to change the distance between the print medium and the light-sensing component, moving the light source from a third position to fourth position, or moving the light-sensing component from a fifth position to a sixth position, and equivalently relocating the light-sensing component from a normal zone where the light-sensing component will receive light reflected from the holographic image of the pattern to a blind zone where the light-sensing component will not receive light reflected from the holographic image of the pattern". This amendment is fully supported in Figures 5-10 and the corresponding paragraphs of the specification, and no new matter is added.

15

10

5

On the other hand, Tahara teaches in column 23, lines 33-39 and in Figure 17 that an information-recorded medium 50 is moved so that receptor element 54 can receive reflected light from the information-recorded medium 50 so as to read information stored on the information-recorded medium 50. However, Tahara only teaches moving the position of information-recorded medium 50, but does not teach "moving the print medium with respect to the light-sensing component from a first position to a second position to change the distance between the print medium and the light-sensing component". In addition, Tahara does not teach moving the positions of the light source and the light-sensing component.

25

20

The Examiner has said that Tahara teaches in column 23, line 47 "In other words, only by use of reader equipment in which light source 44, optical system 45, receptor element 54 and the mechanism (not shown) for moving the information-recorded medium 50 are relatively arranged in such a way that it conforms to the angle and direction of diffraction of the diffracted light 51 is it

possible to read the information of the code portion 42". Thus, the Examiner contends that based on this teaching of Tahara, it is obvious to one skilled in the art to also move the positions of the light source and the light-sensing component.

5

The applicant respectfully disagrees because Tahara is only stating that the relative positions of the light source 44, the optical system 45, and the receptor element 54 need to be aligned perfectly in order for the information on the information-recorded medium 50 to be read when the information-recorded medium 50 is moved. Therefore, Tahara does not teach the claimed features of claim 1. For these reasons, the applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

10

Claims 2-3 and 7 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-3 and 7 is therefore respectfully requested.

15

4. Rejection of claims 4, 5, and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

20

Claims 4, 5, and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al. (US 5,856,048) and Baba et al. (US 5,729,024).

Response:

Claims 4, 5, and 8-12 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 4, 5, and 8-12 is therefore respectfully requested.

25

5. Rejection of claims 6, 13-15, 17, 19-21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 6, 13-15, 17, 19-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al. (US 5,856,048) and Baba et al. (US 5,729,024), and further in view of common knowledge in the art as evidenced by

30

Yoshimura (US 4,796,963).

Response:

5

10

15

20

25

30

Independent claims 13 and 19 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention.

Claim 13 now recites that the adaptor of the image-capturing device upwardly moves the print medium with respect to the light-sensing component from a first position to a second position to change a disposition of the print medium, the light source and the light-sensing component, and for equivalently relocating the light-sensing component from a normal zone where the light-sensing component will receive light reflected from the holographic image of the pattern to a blind zone where the light-sensing component will not receive light reflected from the holographic image of the pattern. As was stated above with respect to claim 1, the cited prior art fails to teach these features recited in claim 13.

Similarly, claim 19 now recites the adaptor is capable of upwardly moving the print medium with respect to the light-sensing component from a first position to a second position to adjust a disposition of the print medium, the light source and the light-sensing component, and of equivalently relocating the light-sensing component from a normal zone where the light-sensing component will receive light reflected from the holographic image of the pattern to a blind zone where the light-sensing component will not receive light reflected from the holographic image of the pattern. These limitations are not taught by the cited prior art, and claims 13 and 19 are therefore patentable.

In addition, claims 6, 17, and 23 recite that the transparent plate comprises a first surface for the print medium to be placed on and a second surface oblique to the first surface.

In contrast, Yoshimura only teaches a transparent plate that is rotated at an angle. Yoshimura does not teach a transparent plate having a first surface and a second surface, in which a print medium is placed on the first surface, and the second surface is oblique to the first surface. Therefore, claims 6, 17, and 23 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Furthermore, claims 6, 14-15, 17, 20-21, and 23 are dependent on claims 1, 13, and 19, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 6, 13-15, 17, 19-21, and 23 is therefore respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claims 16, 18, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 16, 18, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al. (US 5,856,048) and Baba et al. (US 5,729,024), and further in view of common knowledge in the art as evidenced by Yoshimura (US 4,796,963), and further in view of common knowledge in the art as evidenced by Ando et al. (US 5,808,784).

20 Response:

5

10

15

Claims 16, 18, 22, and 24 are dependent on claims 13 and 19, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 16, 18, 22, and 24 is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/711,032 Amdt. dated April 09, 2008 Reply to Office action of January 25, 2008

Sincerely yours,

Wendon ton			
Carlo Cranton and Marie Colonia	Date:	04/09/2008	

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562 Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail: winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)